

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

In re *Ex Parte* Application of
 Dr. Animesh Mishra,
 Applicant.

Case No. 22-cv-08923-BLF

ORDER GRANTING *EX PARTE*
APPLICATION TO AUTHORIZE
FOREIGN DISCOVERY

[Re: ECF No. 1]

On December 16, 2022, Applicant Dr. Animesh Mishra filed an *ex parte* application pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1782 (“Section 1782”) for an order granting leave to obtain limited discovery from Google, LLC and RateMDs, Inc. (“Respondents”) in connection with a potential legal action in Australia. *See* ECF No. 1-1 (“App.”). For the reasons set forth below, the Court GRANTS the application.

I. BACKGROUND

Dr. Mishra is a gastroenterologist and hepatologist in Benowa, Queensland, Australia. ECF No. 1-3 (“Mishra Decl.”) ¶ 2. He relies on his online public profile, including fora hosted by Google and RateMDs, to grow his clientele. *Id.* His business has a profile on Google Maps, and he has a profile on RateMDs. *Id.* ¶¶ 5, 7.

Dr. Mishra states that there have been several fake negative reviews posted about him on Google and RateMDs. Mishra Decl. ¶¶ 9-13, Exs. B-E. He also states that certain individual(s) have given a “thumbs-up” to his negative reviews and “flagged” his positive reviews to alert moderators they should be removed. *Id.* The defamatory Google Reviews were posted by “D Hartly” and “michael Fredrick.” *Id.* ¶¶ 12-13, Exs. D-E.

Dr. Mishra seeks to file a lawsuit in Australia against those individual(s) who posted the

1 reviews. Mishra Decl. ¶ 23. His Australian attorney states that the actions constitute defamation
2 under the common law of Queensland and the State of Queensland’s Defamation Act (2005) (the
3 “Act”). ECF No. 1-4 (“Steele Decl.”) ¶ 4. Pursuant to the Act, the attorney has prepared a
4 “concerns notice” as the first step towards initiating legal proceedings. *Id.* ¶ 5, Ex. D. He plans to
5 send those notice(s) to the appropriate person(s) upon learning their identities to initiate the civil
6 litigation. *Id.* ¶ 6.

7 Applicant is seeking to subpoena Google and RateMDs to learn the identity of the persons
8 who posted, interacted with, and viewed the identified reviews. ECF No. 1-2 (“Donlon Decl.”) ¶
9 1; *see* ECF Nos. 1-5 (Google subpoena), 1-6 (RateMDs subpoena). The subpoenas seek
10 documents or testimony about the identities of those who posted the defamatory reviews, those
11 who interacted with the defamatory reviews, and those who had access to the reviews. App. at 10.
12 The subpoenas seek “any information relating to the identity and contact information, including
13 names, user names and account information (from Google or RateMDs or from any social media
14 provider through which Google or RateMDs were accessed), email addresses, residential
15 addresses, postal code, telephone numbers, and computer/device IP addresses (including location
16 of the IP address), of ‘D Hartly,’ of ‘michael Fredrick,’ of those persons who made the anonymous
17 defamatory reviews, of those who had access to the defamatory reviews and therefore may have
18 read them, of those who gave a thumbs-up to the defamatory reviews, of those who took
19 screenshots of the reviews, and of those who flagged positive reviews since March 11, 2022.” *Id.*
20 at 10-11. They also seek “any other communications that Respondents have received from and
21 sent to the foregoing persons by any means, including email, texts, social media communications,
22 etc.” *Id.* at 11.

23 Applicant filed an *ex parte* application asking this court to authorize the serving of this
24 subpoena on Respondent. App.

25 II. LEGAL STANDARD

26 Section 1782 provides, in relevant part:

27 The district court of the district in which a person resides or is found may order him
28 to give his testimony or statement or to produce a document or other thing for use

1 in a proceeding in a foreign or international tribunal, including criminal
2 investigations conducted before formal accusation. The order may be made ... upon
3 the application of any interested person and may direct that the testimony or
4 statement be given, or the document or other thing be produced, before a person
appointed by the court.... To the extent that the order does not prescribe otherwise,
the testimony or statement shall be taken, and the document or other thing
produced, in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

5 28 U.S.C. § 1782(a). The statute's purpose is "to provide federal-court assistance in the gathering
6 evidence for use in foreign tribunals." *Intel Corp. v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.*, 542 U.S. 241,
7 247 (2004). Section 1782 permits district courts to authorize discovery "where three general
8 requirements are satisfied: (1) the person from whom the discovery is sought 'resides or is found'
9 in the district of the district court where the application is made; (2) the discovery is 'for use in a
10 proceeding in a foreign or international tribunal'; and (3) the application is made by a foreign or
11 international tribunal or 'any interested person.'" *Khrapunov v. Prosyankin*, 931 F.3d 922, 925
12 (9th Cir. 2019) (quoting § 1782(a)).

13 But "a district court is not required to grant a § 1782(a) discovery application simply
14 because it has the authority to do so." *Intel*, 542 U.S. at 264. Instead, a district court has
15 discretion to authorize discovery under Section 1782. *Id.* at 260-61. In exercising this discretion,
16 a district court should consider the following four factors identified by the Supreme Court: (1)
17 whether the "person from whom discovery is sought is a participant in the foreign proceeding"; (2)
18 "the nature of the foreign tribunal, the character of the proceedings underway abroad, and the
19 receptivity of the foreign government or the court or agency abroad to U.S. federal court judicial
20 assistance"; (3) whether the request "conceals an attempt to circumvent foreign proof-gathering
21 restrictions or other policies of a foreign country or the United States"; and (4) whether the request
22 is "unduly intrusive or burdensome." *Id.* at 264-65. In exercising its discretion, the district court
23 should consider the twin aims of the statute: "providing efficient assistance to participants in
24 international litigation and encouraging foreign countries by example to provide similar assistance
25 to our courts." *Id.* at 252.

26 Section 1782 applications are generally considered on an *ex parte* basis because "parties
27 will be given adequate notice of any discovery taken pursuant to the request and will then have the

Apple Inc., 61 F. Supp. 3d 919, 922 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (quoting *In re Republic of Ecuador*, No. C-10-80225 MISC CRB (EMC), 2010 WL 3702427, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2010)).

“Consequently, orders granting § 1782 applications typically only provide that discovery is ‘authorized,’ and thus the opposing party may still raise objections and exercise its due process rights by challenging the discovery after it is issued via a motion to quash, which mitigates concerns regarding any unfairness of granting the application *ex parte*.” *In re Varian Med. Sys. Int’l AG*, No. 16-mc-80048-MEJ, 2016 WL 1161568, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 24, 2016).

III. DISCUSSION

A. Statutory Requirements

Applicant’s request satisfies the requirements of Section 1782. First, the statute requires that the respondent be found in the district. A business entity is “found” in the judicial district where it is incorporated or headquartered. *Illumina Cambridge Ltd. v. Complete Genomics, Inc.*, No. 19-mc-80215-WHO(TSH), 2020 WL 820327, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 19, 2020) (collecting cases). Google is headquartered in Mountain View, California. Donlon Decl. ¶¶ 3-4, Exs. A-B. And RateMDs is incorporated in Santa Clara County, California. Donlon Decl. ¶¶ 10-11, Exs. G-H. Both are within this district, so this requirement is met.

Second, the discovery must be for use in a proceeding in a foreign tribunal. For a proceeding to meet this requirement, it need not be “pending” or “imminent”; it need only be “within reasonable contemplation.” *Intel*, 542 U.S. at 259. Here, a civil lawsuit is within reasonable contemplation because Dr. Mishra has declared that he intends to bring a lawsuit under Australian law once he learns the identity of the putative defendant(s). Mishra Decl. ¶ 23. He has already retained counsel for the purpose of doing so. Mishra Decl. ¶ 23; *see also* Steele Decl. ¶ 1, Donlon Decl. ¶ 1. Further, his attorney has prepared a “concerns notice,” which is the first step towards starting this civil litigation in Australia. Mishra Decl. ¶ 23; Steele Decl. ¶¶ 5-6.

Third, an application under Section 1782 must be brought by an “interested person.” A litigant in a foreign proceeding is an “interested person” for purposes of Section 1782. *Intel*, 542 U.S. at 256-57. As the putative plaintiff in the civil lawsuit, Dr. Mishra is an interested person.

Mishra Decl. ¶ 23

B. Discretionary *Intel* Factors

The discretionary factors identified by the Supreme Court in *Intel* also weigh in favor of the Court granting the application.

1. Respondents are not participants in the foreign action.

The first factor, whether the respondent is a participant in the foreign action, supports obtaining discovery from entities who are not parties in the foreign tribunal. *Intel*, 542 U.S. at 264. “[N]onparticipants in the foreign proceeding may be outside the foreign tribunal’s jurisdictional reach; hence, their evidence, available in the United States, may be unobtainable absent § 1782(a) aid.” *Id.* Here, Google and RateMDs will not be parties or participants in the Australian civil lawsuit. Mishra Decl. ¶ 23; Steele Decl. ¶ 6. This factor therefore weighs in favor of granting the application.

2. Australian courts are receptive to U.S. judicial assistance.

The Supreme Court next requires a district court to consider “the nature of the foreign tribunal, the character of the proceedings underway abroad, and the receptivity of the foreign government or the court or agency abroad to U.S. federal-court judicial assistance.” *Intel*, 542 U.S. at 264. “This factor focuses on whether the foreign tribunal is willing to consider the information sought.” *In re Varian Med. Sys.*, No. 16-mc-80048-MEJ, 2016 WL 1161568, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 24, 2016).

Dr. Mishra’s Australian counsel submitted a declaration stating that Australian courts are receptive to receiving discovery from the United States. Steele Decl. ¶ 7. Further, his counsel submitted a copy of a decision of the Federal Court of Australia with similar facts to those here, in which the court states that the plaintiff in that case obtained the IP address of the individual who posted the defamatory review from RateMDs through a subpoena. *Id.* ¶¶ 9, Ex. G.

The Court is not aware of any directive from Australia against the use of Section 1782 evidence. *See In re Jt. Stock Co. Raiffeisenbank*, No. 16-mc-80203-MEJ, 2016 WL 6474224, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 2, 2016) (“Absent this type of clear directive, however, a district court’s ruling should be informed by section 1782’s overarching interest in ‘providing equitable and efficacious procedures for the benefit of tribunals and litigants involved in litigation and international

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.